

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION**

KONNECH, INC.,

PLAINTIFF,

v.

**TRUE THE VOTE, INC., GREGG
PHILLIPS, and CATHERINE
ENGELBRECHT,**

DEFENDANTS.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:22-CV-03096

**PLAINTIFF KONNECH, INC.’S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION TO SHOW
CAUSE AND FOR CONTEMPT AGAINST DEFENDANTS RELATED TO THE
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION AND DIRECT ORDERS FROM THE BENCH**

Plaintiff Konnech, Inc. files this Reply in Support of its Motion to Show Cause and For Contempt Against Defendants Related to the Preliminary Injunction and Direct Orders from the Bench (“Motion”), and shows the Court as follows:

I. Defendants Are Indisputably In Contempt of the Preliminary Injunction and Direct Orders From the Bench

Defendants are indisputably in contempt of the Preliminary Injunction and direct orders from the bench. Defendants failed to present any argument or evidence in response to Konnech’s evidence that Defendants violated multiple provisions in the Preliminary Injunction and a direct bench order, including:

- Section 3 (identified those involved in accessing Konnech’s computers)
- Section 6 (disclose how Konnech’s computers were accessed)
- Section 7 (the identity of all persons who have had possession, custody or control of Konnech data)
- A direct order from the bench to identify each person in the hotel room with Defendant Phillips and Mike Hasson in January 2021.

Defendants’ Response also wholly fails to address their contemptuous and reprehensible social media posts that attack the Court and Mr. Yu. (Doc. 67 at pp. 11-14). Indeed, Defendant

True the Vote's webpage contains a page solely dedicated to posts related to the above-captioned lawsuit, on which Defendant True the Vote proudly displays an article entitled "Judge Hoyt: The Most Biased Civil Case Ever Tried?"¹ The article states, among other things, that "[f]rom the start of this case, Judge Hoyt has had it out for True the Vote," and that Judge Hoyt has demonstrated "bias[] and hypocrisy," and that "Konnech's lawyers, along with Judge Hoyt, seem to conspire[.]"²

Defendant Phillips' particular contempt for this Court and these legal proceedings is further demonstrated by juvenile name-calling in which he refers to Judge Hoyt as "Screwtape," an apparent reference to C.S. Lewis's "The Screwtape Letters," which is a series of letters about Screwtape, a senior official in Hell (i.e., a demon), to his nephew, Wormwood, a younger less-experienced demon:



It is undisputed that Defendants remain in contempt of the Preliminary Injunction and bench orders.

¹ See <https://www.truethevote.org/judge-hoyt-the-most-biased-civil-case-ever-tried/>.

² *Id.*

II. Defendants Cannot Avoid Their Contempt by Challenging the Preliminary Injunction

Defendants only seek to excuse their contempt by impermissibly challenging the underlying Preliminary Injunction itself after violating it, even though they did not appeal its issuance within the prescribed period of time. *See United States v. Rylander*, 460 U.S. 752, 756–57 (1983) (explaining “it would be a disserve to the law if we were to depart from the long-standing rule that a contempt proceeding does not open to reconsideration the legal or factual basis of the order alleged to have been disobeyed and thus become a retrial of the original controversy”). Even if Defendants’ challenge to the Preliminary Injunction were permissible and valid, which it is not, it still does not excuse their contempt of the Court’s bench orders.

Defendants’ argument, with no supporting evidence, that the Preliminary Injunction should not have issued because they did not “access a computer belonging to Konnech” (Doc. 71 at 1) is belied by the evidence Konnech submitted and Defendants’ own testimony. Defendants’ own pre-suit statements—which were properly submitted as evidence by Konnech and considered by the Court in granting the Preliminary Injunction—admit that the server in question was a Konnech computer. (Doc. 5, 5-1, 69). Indeed, as further highlighted in Konnech’s Response to Defendants’ Motion to Dissolve Preliminary Injunction, which is incorporated fully herein (Doc. 69), in explaining whose computer Defendants and their co-conspirators breached, Defendants specifically referred to Konnech by name, referred to the tradename of the software it owns (i.e., “PollChief”), and otherwise referred to the location of Konnech’s offices.³ (*Id.* at pp. 12-18). Full

³ Defendants claim that the Court “made a telling error” by referring to the Taylor Phillips social media post in its Memorandum Opinion and Order on Motion for a Preliminary Injunction, because they say that the “text does not come from Defendants.” (Resp. at pp. 12-13). But Defendants are wrong. The post was “ReTruthed” by Defendant Phillips, which is therefore necessarily a statement by him.

transcripts of these podcasts were submitted with Konnech’s Motion for Preliminary Injunction for the Court’s consideration.

Defendants cannot otherwise hide from their own in-Court testimony where they further admitted that the server at issue was a Konnech computer. (*See e.g.*, Doc. 69, Ex. A at 59:5-11) (“Q. Was there anything on that data that you saw that indicated it came from Konnech? A. Well, it came from an IP address that the URL that they were accessing it through resolved to. Yes. Q. Was there anything on the data itself that said ‘Konnech’? A. Yes.”). And although both Defendants Phillips and Engelbrecht submitted affidavits with Defendants’ Response, it is notable that neither of those affidavits contains any statements supporting their counsel’s argument that “Defendants never accessed a computer belonging to Konnech[.]” (Resp. at p. 19).

Furthermore, after Konnech filed its Motion, Defendant Phillips appeared on a December 15, 2022 podcast called the “Rick & Bubba Show” during which Defendant Phillips further demonstrates his contempt. Specifically, during the October 27, 2022 show cause hearing, Defendant Phillips repeatedly denied downloading any data while at the Dallas hotel in January 2021. (Ex. A, Oct. 27 Hrg. Tr. at 32:4-9; 33:3-11; 66:8-11). However, during his appearance on the Rick & Bubba Show, Defendant Phillips states that Judge Hoyt, who he refers to as an “activist judge” “ordered us to, or me, to tell him who was in the room with me that night **when we downloaded the data.**” (Ex. B, Richardson Decl. at B-1, B-2). Additionally, despite testifying at the October 27 show cause hearing that Mike Hasson was the only person involved in accessing Konnech’s data (*see e.g.*, Ex. A, Oct. 27 Hrg. Tr. at 30:20-31:3), Defendant Phillips stated on the Rick & Bubba show that he “went to a meeting in Dallas with a **couple of researchers** and um, uncovered, a bunch of information, or they shared with me a bunch of information that **they had uncovered[.]**” (Ex. B, Richardson Decl. at B-1, B-2). In other words, Defendant Phillips once again admits he met with more than one “researcher” who had together “uncovered” data relating

to Konnech. Such a statement speaking in plurality is not limited to Mike Hasson. Defendant Phillips should be ordered to appear and answer for his contemptuous conduct.

For the reasons stated in Konnech's Motion for Preliminary Injunction (Doc. 5) and, most recently, in its Response to Defendants' Motion to Dissolve (Doc. 69), the Preliminary Injunction was properly issued.⁴ Defendants must therefore comply with it.

III. Defendants Should be Ordered to Show Cause Why They Should Not Be Held in Contempt of Section 4 of the Preliminary Injunction Concerning the ODS File

Konnech presented evidence to the Court demonstrating that Defendants possessed an ODS file (i.e., a spreadsheet) containing PII, including social security numbers, sorted by state, which if related to Konnech would be a direct violation of Section 4 of the Preliminary Injunction which requires Defendants to return to Konnech all property or data obtained from Konnech's computers, whether original, duplicated, handwritten, or any other form, whatsoever obtained from any source. Although Defendants admit that they are in possession of this ODS file and that they submitted a picture of the file cover as "Evidence in Furtherance of Request to Purge Finding of Contempt," (Doc. 46), they have not submitted the ODS file itself to the Court or Konnech. Instead, they now claim, unconvincingly, that they do not believe the file contains any Konnech data.

The ODS file states on its face that it contains PII, including social security numbers, sorted by state. (Doc. 46-2). This is particularly concerning to Konnech because the data Defendants claimed to have taken from Konnech included the personal identifying information, including social security numbers, of millions of U.S. poll workers. (Doc. 5 at Ex. A-1, A-2, A-4).

⁴ Defendants also argue that because the 2022 midterm elections are over there is no longer any threat of irreparable harm. This is nonsense. Unless and until Defendants agree to a permanent injunction enjoining them from, among other things, ever accessing a Konnech computer, there is the continued threat of immediate and irreparable harm to Konnech's data and its reputation.

Remarkably, after submitting a text containing this ODS file as evidence to purge their contempt in this action, they now claim that they “have no reason to believe it had anything to do with Konnech.” (Doc. 71-1 at ¶ 4). Defendants need to explain why they submitted that as evidence in this action.

Defendants’ affidavits submitted with their Response raises more questions about the ODS file than it answers. For example, Defendant Phillips’ affidavit incorporates what are apparently screenshots of his communications with the alleged anonymous source who provided him with the ODS file, but he failed to submit the file itself. Additionally, despite Defendant Phillips claiming that the alleged anonymous source “began to make threatening comments,” (Doc. 71-1 at ¶ 6), he did not attach a copy of those alleged threats or any discussion with anyone else about those threats. It begs the question how Defendant Phillips would have screenshots of other communications with this anonymous source, but not a death threat. Indeed, Defendant Engelbrecht similarly stated in her affidavit that the alleged anonymous source said “we will kill you,” but also failed to attach any proof of such a communication. (71-2 at ¶ 6). Further, Defendant Phillips should be required to explain what his “guys” found with respect to the ODS file and whether they retained a copy of it, as Defendant Phillips’ affidavit states that he “will get one of my guys on this.” (Doc. 71-1 at ¶ 4). Defendants should also be required to testify and explain what the FBI told them was in the ODS file, as both of Defendants’ affidavits state that they reported the file to the FBI. (*Id.* at ¶ 13; Doc. 71-2 at ¶¶ 10-11).

But moreover, Defendants’ affidavits are not trustworthy. In both Defendant Phillips’ and Defendant Engelbrecht’s affidavits, they incredibly state that “I have no reason to believe that the letter ‘PII’ in the file name necessary refer to ‘personal identifying information’[.]” (Doc. 71-1 at ¶ 12; doc. 71-2 at ¶ 9). However, in Defendant Phillips’ Affidavit, the text message from the anonymous source that he embeds specifically refers to “names, DOBs, SSNs, and Driver License

#s.” (Doc. 71-1 at ¶ 5). Further, in a text message with a purported FBI agent embedded in Defendant Engelbrecht’s affidavit, Defendant Engelbrecht specifically told the agent that “The file name suggests there is PII in it.” (Doc. 71-2 at ¶ 11).

Defendants should be ordered to appear and show cause why they are not in violation of Section 4 of the Preliminary Injunction.

CONCLUSION

Konnech, Inc. respectfully requests that the Court enter an order directing that Defendants appear before the Court and show why they should not be held in contempt of the Preliminary Injunction and direct Court order from the bench. Konnech, Inc. further respectfully requests that, after the show cause hearing, the Court enter an order: (i) holding Defendants in contempt; (ii) awarding Konnech compensatory and coercive sanctions which the Court deems necessary to obtain Defendants’ compliance and to deter further contempt; and (iii) for such other and further relief to which Konnech, Inc. may be justly entitled.

Dated: December 29, 2022

KASOWITZ BENSON TORRES LLP

By: /s/Constantine Z. Pamphilis
Constantine Z. Pamphilis
Attorney in Charge
Texas State Bar No. 00794419
SDTX Bar No. 19378
DPamphilis@kasowitz.com
Nathan W. Richardson
Texas State Bar No. 24094914
SDTX Bar No. 24094914
NRichardson@kasowitz.com
1415 Louisiana Street, Suite 2100
Houston, Texas 77002
(713) 220-8800
(713) 222-0843 (fax)

Attorneys for Plaintiff Konnech, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on December 29, 2022, true and correct copies of the above and foregoing were forwarded to all parties and counsel of record through the ECF filing system.

/s/Nathan W. Richardson
Nathan W. Richardson

Exhibit A

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

THE HONORABLE KENNETH M. HOYT, JUDGE PRESIDING

KONNECH, INC.,) Cause No. 4:22-cv-03096
)
Plaintiff,)
)
vs.)
)
TRUE THE VOTE, et al.,)
)
Defendants.)
)

HEARING

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT

Houston, Texas

October 27, 2022

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the Plaintiff:

Constantine Z. Pamphilis, Esq.

Nathan Richardson, Esq.

On behalf of the Defendants:

Brock Cordt Akers, Esq. (Not present)

Michael John Wynne, Esq

John C. Kiyonaga, Esq.

Reported By: Nichole Forrest, CSR, RDR, CRR, CRC
Certified Realtime Reporter
United States District Court
Southern District of Texas

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography.
Transcript produced by Reporter on computer.

1 Q. All that said, do you feel that you are
2 qualified today to respond to the specific enumerated
3 items set out in the temporary restraining order on
4 behalf of all three of the named defendants?

5 A. Yes, sir.

6 Q. I'm going to hand you a copy of that
7 temporary restraining order, which is docket entry
8 number 9 in this proceeding.

9 I'm going to turn to the items that were
10 discussed earlier today; those being small Roman
11 numeral 5, 6 and 7.

12 May I approach?

13 THE COURT: Please.

14 BY MR. WYNNE:

15 Q. Now, you understand the Court has ordered the
16 three defendants to respond to -- I'll start with
17 small Roman numeral 5.

18 A. Yes, sir.

19 Q. Would you please read that?

20 A. "Ordered to identify each individual and/or
21 organization involved in accessing Konnech's protected
22 computers."

23 Q. How do you understand the term "accessing"?

24 A. I assume, having some access to the data
25 inside the computer.

1 Q. Let me ask you to answer that question.

2 Within your personal knowledge, what is the answer?

3 A. Mike Hasson.

4 Q. Is that the spelling that has been provided
5 earlier today?

6 A. Yes, sir.

7 Q. Do you personally have any address or other
8 information that might assist someone in locating
9 Mr. Hasson?

10 A. No, sir.

11 Q. When did you first meet him?

12 A. I probably met him some time in the -- you
13 know, mid-2014, '15.

14 Q. With regard to this case -- with regard to
15 this case and in responding to the question that the
16 Court has posed, what is the basis for your statement
17 that he is the only one you're aware of who accessed
18 the information stored on what's described as
19 Konnech's computer, although there is some question
20 about actual ownership? How do you know that?

21 A. How do I know that he was the only one?

22 Q. How do you know that he was the one in any
23 respect whatsoever?

24 A. I was asked to come to a meeting in a hotel
25 in Dallas in -- sometime late January, early February

1 of 2021 I met Mike. And he plugged his computer into
2 the -- the television in the hotel room and showed me
3 what he had found.

4 Q. Did any -- forgive me if I get the
5 terminology -- but did any downloading occur in your
6 presence in that hotel room when the -- whatever was
7 up on the TV screen was up on the TV screen -- was any
8 access happening?

9 A. No.

10 Q. Did it appear to you that any accessing that
11 was done had already been done by the time you walked
12 into the hotel room?

13 A. Yes, sir.

14 MR. PAMPHILIS: Your Honor, I would object
15 to leading the witness. This is his witness.

16 THE COURT: I'll sustain it.

17 BY MR. WYNNE:

18 Q. What, if anything, was your impression on the
19 temporal relationship -- that is the time relationship
20 between when you walked into the hotel room and
21 whenever whoever it was downloaded the information or
22 data that appeared on the TV monitor that you saw?

23 A. It took about 20 minutes to get his computer
24 hooked to the television screen. He had a problem
25 with the cord that needed to hook into the hotel

1 screen. Once he pulled it up, he went straight to his
2 files that he was showing me.

3 Q. Was it your impression that information was
4 actively being retrieved at that moment in the hotel
5 room, or was it your impression that that had already
6 been done, and he was showing you something that had
7 been done in the past?

8 A. I think it was being done in the past. He
9 certainly wouldn't have been -- there wouldn't have
10 been enough bandwidth at the hotel to download that
11 kind of data.

12 Q. Do you have, in your possession, a copy of
13 this electronic information that was displayed on that
14 screen in the hotel room in Dallas?

15 A. No, sir.

16 Q. Does Ms. Engelbrecht have a copy?

17 A. No.

18 Q. Does True The Vote have a copy?

19 A. No, sir.

20 Q. Does anybody associated with True The Vote
21 have a copy?

22 A. No, sir.

23 Q. Who else, if anyone, in your personal
24 knowledge -- let me put it like this: To the best of
25 your knowledge, whether direct or indirect, has a copy

1 data?

2 A. Yes, sir.

3 Q. Were all three of you looking at the data?

4 A. It was mostly me and Hasson.

5 Q. And did you see how Mr. Hasson accessed the
6 data?

7 A. No, sir.

8 Q. He already had it downloaded somewhere else,
9 and then he showed it to you. Is that how it worked?

10 A. I don't know the answer to that, but I
11 believe that is true, yes.

12 Q. Because it was so large, you believe that he
13 connected to the internet and was able to pull the
14 data from another computer?

15 A. I don't know.

16 Q. Do you know if Mr. Hasson still has that
17 data?

18 A. I do not know.

19 Q. Do you know anybody other than the FBI that
20 has that data?

21 A. No, sir.

22 Q. You've never provided that data to any other
23 law enforcement, have you?

24 A. No, sir.

25 Q. And you're not the one who provided it to the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I hereby certify that pursuant to Title
28, Section 753 United States Code, the foregoing is a
true and correct transcript of the stenographically
reported proceedings in the above matter.

Certified on October 30, 2022.

/s/ Nichole Forrest
Nichole Forrest, RDR, CRR, CRC

Exhibit B

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION**

KONNECH, INC.,

PLAINTIFF,

v.

**TRUE THE VOTE, INC., GREGG
PHILLIPS, and CATHERINE
ENGELBRECHT,**

DEFENDANTS.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:22-CV-03096

**DECLARATION OF NATHAN W. RICHARDSON IN SUPPORT OF
PLAINTIFF KONNECH, INC.’S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION TO SHOW
CAUSE AND FOR CONTEMPT AGAINST DEFENDANTS RELATED TO THE
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION AND DIRECT ORDERS FROM THE BENCH**

NATHAN W. RICHARDSON, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, declares as follows:

1. My name is Nathan W. Richardson. I am of sound mind, over eighteen years of age, and fully competent to make this declaration. I have personal knowledge of the facts stated in this declaration. All of the facts stated in the declaration are true and correct.

2. From approximately August 2022 to the present, I have served as counsel for Konnech, Inc. (“Konnech”) in connection with the above-referenced lawsuit. In that capacity, I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration.

3. I submit this declaration in support of Konnech’s Reply in Support of its Motion to Show Cause and for Contempt Against Defendants Related to the Preliminary Injunction and Direct Orders from the Bench (the “Reply in Support of Motion to Show Cause and for Contempt”).


4. Attached hereto as **Exhibit B-1** is a true and correct copy of a video of the December 15, 2022 episode of a podcast called the Rick & Bubba Show (the “Rick & Bubba

Show Podcast”). In the video, Gregg Phillips sits for an interview for approximately twenty-five minutes, which begins at the 2 hour 28 minute and 45 second mark (2:28:45). The video can be found here <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oXdHwpPy0zY&t=9105s>, and a flash drive with a copy of the recording will be filed with the Court contemporaneously with the filing of Konnech’s Reply in Support of Motion to Show Cause and for Contempt and this Declaration.

5. Attached hereto as **Exhibit B-2** is a true and correct copy of a transcript of the portion of the December 15, 2022 episode of the Rick & Bubba Show Podcast featuring Gregg Phillips, which is being produced in native format as Exhibit B-1.

Pursuant to the authority of 28 U.S.C. § 1746, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: December 29, 2022
Houston, Texas



Nathan W. Richardson

Exhibit B-1

NATIVE DOCUMENT PLACEHOLDER

**Video of the December 15, 2022 episode of
the Rick & Bubba Show podcast, provided to
the Court via flash drive.**

Exhibit B-2

Gregg Phillips on Rick & Bubba_Dec 15 2022_Long

Thu, Dec 29, 2022 2:28PM • 24:21

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

fight, court, called, arizona, judge, greg phillips, people, china, greg, jail, pray, election, screwtape, day, folks, activist judges, catherine, bubba, lawyers, midterm election

SPEAKERS

Gregg Phillips

Gregg Phillips 00:00

place where you could be understood. So we're gonna put you back on hold get a little more information. And congratulations on winning gift number 11

00:09

Thank you my husband is happy I bet

Gregg Phillips 00:13

he's gonna enjoy this all right Carrie I'll put you on hold. Yes you will. Christmas. You know Rick, I have seen you can never have too many to know I mean it because you never know what you're going to eat in the worst case to say if I just had that in filling the bill. I know.

Gregg Phillips 00:28

Bubba, Gregg Phillips is back.

00:30

Gregg Phillips, Gregg, so good to see you. We've been worried about you. But as I mentioned earlier, you got to watch those parking tickets they can add up.

Gregg Phillips 00:43

If parking tickets result in strip search by the US federal marshals, what's happened to the world?

00:52

You saw Gregg if you watched Dinesh D'Souza is 2000 mules, you know, he is with True the Vote. And also just, I just, you know, we we've said this, and you and I were talking in the break, our founding fathers tried so hard to warn us. Because see, we're so far removed now from the King. And we

foolishly don't understand tyranny anymore. Because they understood it because they just left it. They knew the dangers of all this

01:22

It's tyranny by group now, not just one.

Gregg Phillips 01:25

But you faced it. If you're not understanding what the Founding Fathers, I'm talking to you America right now and us, if you don't understand why they warned, every single power that you allow the central government to take, they'll abuse it, and they can use it against you. And that's why the founder said don't give them much. Here's what the Constitution said they should have. It's limited. And don't let them get outside of this. And let them develop all these agencies and all this stuff that they can use against you. Because if they get it, they will. And you experienced that. And you said that you thought it so tell us what happened. And then, you know, we know you're out of jail now. But But what happened?

Gregg Phillips 02:10

So in January of 2021, I went to a meeting in Dallas with a couple of researchers and uncovered a bunch of information, or they shared with me a bunch of information that they had uncovered, relative to the American election information being in China, it was irrefutable. It wasn't like you had to believe that there was some packet of information flying through there or anything like that this information was in China. After 18 months of working with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, they decided to really do nothing. So So Los Angeles County ends up arresting this guy. This this dude that runs this company, same day that I was out in Los Angeles County for the grand jury. They this this Chinese this Chinese guy sued us for defamation in federal court in Houston. We ended up in federal court, and this judge was at kind of an activist judge and and he ordered us to or me to tell him who was in the room with me that night when we downloaded the data. And, and I said No, sir, I'm not going to do it. And he said, he said, Well, I'm gonna hold you in contempt of court. Okay. He said, We'll be here next Monday. This was on a Thursday, Monday morning, nine o'clock. We were there.

Gregg Phillips 03:42

Our lawyer stood up judge said Is he going to tell? Is he going to tell me he was in that room with him? And our lawyer said, No, he's not. And judge ordered us into custody. The US federal marshals, we ended up in a medium security prison. Me in AdSeg and my partner Catherine in this sort of weird medical isolation where they had windows and stuff she couldn't even go the bathroom without folks walking by and, and strip searched me. And I mean, the whole thing was completely insane. All because I wouldn't share the name of an individual that was in the room with me. The reason I wouldn't do it was he was a he was a federal informant. He works on the border and works in all kinds of trafficking cases, human trafficking, drug trafficking, and this guy would be in danger if I blurted his name out. We told the judge that, and he didn't care. So he put me in jail, put Catherine in jail.

Gregg Phillips 04:36

So how did you get out? Because we did the start. When you went into jail. Of course, people started calling us we saw the story. How do you how do you how did you get the judge to let you out? We have

some amazing lawyers that appealed to the US District Court of Appeals in New Orleans and the fifth the fifth district came back in a day or so and said you need to let them out now.

Gregg Phillips 05:01

Also compelled them to, these these two lawyers. On the other side, I was so mad at them anyway, because they were mocking us during the trial. I mean, they were sitting behind me just laughing while the judge was interrogating us and all this stuff, and, and I kind of call them Wormwood and Screwtape. And they got all upset about that.

05:22

And did they even know what the reference was? Probably not probably, probably not.

Gregg Phillips 05:27

And so our lawyers made this appeal, they ordered us to be released. And and I think one of the things that really as I look back at the whole deal was the court really slammed what happened, right. They the court, the the appeals court was not happy that we were in there. The Sunday that we were finally released, the court said, Okay, let them out. They couldn't figure out how to let us out. So this was on Sunday, guy named Steve Toth, who is the state rep in Texas coming, hey, come by a couple different times to pray with us and just think and just, you know, just praise the Lord, you know, that we were at least alive and well, and then we hadn't killed ourselves like Epstein had done. Or didn't do. And that that day, so he comes in, he prays with us, and he goes outside as he was leaving, I said, Well, why are you here? He said, Well, we're having a little prayer vigil outside the prison. And I said, a little prayer vigil. I looked outside there was like, 100. And I mean, you could see kind of through the glass. There was 100, some odd folks out there in a driving rainstorm, a thunderstorm and they were out there singing the national anthem, and praying for us for two hours, about 15 minutes after they got done. The court order came down from New Orleans, and they let us out and then they spent 24 hours trying to figure out how to let us out and eventually let us out. But folks were great. I mean, President Trump called

Gregg Phillips 07:01

got wind of what was going on and called around and did a wellness check on us, the federal marshal, the US Marshal came by US Marshal in the Southern District of Texas came by to visit and just to be sure that we were okay and alive and well, and, but it was, it was something I mean, being in isolation. I was in administrative segregation for the first little bit, which is a whole wild place and by the way prison during the day and prison at night are too different things.

07:28

I would think it would be.

Gregg Phillips 07:30

And so anyway, this US Marshal came by President Trump called the warden President Trump called the governor and a few other folks and, and so we had a lot of folks rooting for us a lot of folks praying for us and but in the end, the US District Court of Appeals in New Orleans, said, No, we're not doing this. Now, we're still in that case, and that judge is still on on this case, as well. So I have to be a little

careful. But I think the biggest problem that America may or may not know about it, you got these activist judges, right. And they're, they're called being on senior status. So they retire, they go home, they get \$200,000 A year or something to retire. But they can come back and pick and choose whatever case they want. And so these these rogue lawyers, Screwtape, and Wormwood would go out and pick this judge, get this case into his court. And man, he flat out interrogated us from the stand, you know, included himself and saying, We and I and, and it was just it was just an incredible experience for us, but, but true to form my partner, Catherine, I got out I was mad. So so that time I got out and I walked out through that razor wire and got out to the car. I was I was furious. I was mad, I would have fought somebody if they'd been that didn't matter who it was, I was just mad. We get in the car. And, and, and I'm expecting Catherine to be you know, either either mad with me or in tears or something. And she's over there, like philosophically saying, well, here's what I learned while I was in prison. What do you mean, what do you learn, I learned that the hotdogs are something akin to like a plastic straw. And the food's not edible. And there's a lot of things going on at night in prison that nobody needs to know about. Right? Those are all things I learned and I still want to fight and she's like, well, I learned that you know, God was there with me the whole time. And I pray not Well, I pray to but I still want to fight.

Gregg Phillips 09:27

Well, let's come back. And we'll do one more segment with Greg but he's back you may have questions. And he may or may not be able to answer them. But if you can call him in at 866 we be big and kind of get caught up with Greg Phillips who he and Catherine are now out of jail. But it is true and all of you started calling us they were put in jail as he just said and how it happened and we'll be back more Rick and Bubba coming up run after this.

09:54

Rick and Bubba Rick and Bubba

[BREAK BETWEEN SEGMENTS...EXTRANEIOUS]

15:23

Gregg Phillips is our guest. He's part of True the Vote. You see he and Catherine who's also part interviewed extensively and 2000 Mules. Dinesh D'Souza, his book and documentary, movie, and they both were held in contempt of court. They were in jail for eight days because they refused to release the name of man that they called a confidential FBI informant and I want to put him in danger. And this is a civil Trial. Yeah, yes. So make sure we got that, that person remains

Gregg Phillips 16:00

A civil trial and a TRO. This was just a temporary restraining order and grind. But this was an activist judge, and he wanted, you know, he wanted to get his pound of flesh from this and lock us up before the election.

16:12

Yeah. And that was interesting to the eight days that you were held, and put you in jail. That got you out, really, with no time to be involved with the midterm elections,

Gregg Phillips 16:23

Less than 24 hours after getting out I was standing in, in Arizona, working with the Lake campaign, the Finchem campaign and others on what was going on in Arizona on election day.

16:34

So Greg, here's the thing and 2000 Mules was controversial. Some people say, hey, you're on to something, some people think you guys are crazy. Well, yeah, I mean, you know that. And as I told you, in the break, if something is invisible, or it's cloaked, or somebody's trying to hide it, it still cast a shadow. And, to me, the fact that these people were willing to go to this length, to get you guys in court, hold you in contempt lock you up in a civil trial with a temporary restraining order. I mean, that was, was really what you were in court debating is it's just unheard of. And to me, that shows that they're out to get you in a way that doesn't really fit the crime, so to speak. If that if I can borrow that for the child, I don't know that you've you've made it a crime, but it doesn't fit the charge. And it just shows that they want to hush you up. So if they're that going to that extreme to hush you up, what you're saying must be something that really, really bothers them.

Gregg Phillips 17:49

Yeah, it really does. We were running the True the Vote election integrity hotline in places like Arizona, you can imagine the last week before that election, it was blowing up. And and places Arizona, Pennsylvania and other other places. They just didn't want us out there. They didn't want to talk. And we've had a lot of information that folks don't want us to have, here's the reality, they can say or do anything they want all of that information. And more is in China. The the we later uncovered that there were the machine serial numbers for the ballot counting machines in China, there are the the ballot bundle serial numbers, they're all in China, they all live on one server in China. And what's most interesting about it in that particular server also runs another set of elections, the CCPs own elections in China, in that server in China, and you can't refute it. I mean, you can say you don't like me, you can say he's a whatever, you can put me in jail, you can do whatever you want to me, it's not going to change the fact that this data, and all of this information is in China, we've been completely compromised in this country if we don't wake up and and, you know, fight back against these activist judges and in you know, Screwtape and Warmblood and everybody else. We're not going to survive this.

19:13

Yeah, that's the other part and you hit it there. You're also revealing which we all have been concerned about and apparently rightfully so activist judges. So I mean, they're weapons with the arm absolute Gregg. So the midterm election, was it tampered with?

Gregg Phillips 19:30

We we believe specifically in Arizona, because we're pretty heavily involved because of our work with the hotline and our work with True the Vote there that that what happened to the voters of Arizona outside of Maricopa is tyranny. So you have voters in places like Mojave that were doing the right thing. The election officials were conducting the election in the right way. They were reviewing signatures, they were matching signatures they were eliminating some including others as appropriate. And that

wasn't happening in Arizona or in Maricopa. And so you have a place like Maricopa, which includes 62% of the vote in Arizona. You've got all these other counties folks out doing it the right way. And they're being held hostage by Maricopa County in the bad guys, Maricopa County. So I would answer the the question. Absolutely, yes. That this, this was a scam. And we look for our day in court. And there's some plaintiffs there that have asked demanded a jury trial in the Mojave County. And we look forward to their day in court.

20:36

Transcend Hoover, he did have one question, and we'll try to get into question or two from the audience drink. Go ahead. You're on with Gregg Phillips.

20:43

Hey, thanks. Hey, nice talking to you all today. It's our pleasure. Yeah. One thing, my wife and I noticed after watching 2000 Mule, how come this talk is not getting any more traction, or any more notoriety? It doesn't show up really, in any news to speak out. So unless you actually, you know, go read the book now or watch the documentary. You know, how do people even know?

Gregg Phillips 21:08

Well, there were 24 million people that saw this movie worldwide. So you know, don't don't despair too much about that. I mean, we don't. The the situation is that the mainstream media refused to cover it. Everybody from Fox to CNN, and everybody else just refused to cover it. The good news is, though, that all of those people being able to see it, it was the number one movie on Amazon for three months, it was the number one movie in the world for 30 days. And so folks everywhere have seen it. We've had people contacting us from Spain and Italy, and in Australia, the, you know, the white hot light of freedom is real. And it exists around the world. And it's not just in America, folks, or you know, they look at America as to is this the bellwether? Well, American elections are wack.

22:00

Yeah. And if that's the case, like you said, all over the world, they're like, oh, what does that mean for us? Well, Greg, we're glad you're out. You have our best to Catherine as well. I'm sorry for what you guys were put through. Yeah. But also thankful for, you know, those in the court of appeals did grant your release in the fifth district circuit, I'm sorry. So that that helps. That you were able to find somebody to hear your case and say, Hey, this was wrong. But the problem is, nobody can give back. What was taken from me.

22:33

My youngest son, John, David and his fiancée, Emma are getting married this weekend. And I can tell you that it was not lost on me as I laid there and stared at the ceiling at night, Man, I miss that kid's wedding and somebody's gonna kill.

22:45

That's true. We're glad you're back. And thanks for the work you guys continue to do. But as, as we all know, throughout the history of our country in the history of the world, it's, there's always a price to pay if you're willing to fight for freedom. Always. top of the hour. If you Gregg, thank you great if you're

leaving us guys have a great day. If you have more Rick and Bubba top of the hour, we'll be right back.
Rick and Bubba Rick and Bubba